

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 have been amended. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the subject matter. Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office asserts that the claims allegedly contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a ways as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The Office specifically points to the “administrator access” feature of independent claims 1, 8, 15, and 21. Applicants have deleted this feature from these claims and amended the claims to disclose “allowing an administrator to append at least one character to the previously unused electronic address that is at least one of the following: not unique or does not comply with the predetermined addressing standard, wherein appending the at least one character creates a valid electronic address.” Applicants contend that proper support for this amendment can be found in paragraph [0029] of

the Application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stern (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0032740) in view of Bliss et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6654789), hereinafter “Stern” and “Bliss” respectively.

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection over Stern in view of Bliss, Applicant asserts that neither Stern nor Bliss teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, with respect to independent claim 1 (and similarly 8, 15, and 21), Applicant submits that Stern and Bliss fail to teach or suggest “**automatically** determining a valid electronic address for assigning to a user by iterating through the sequence of address generation scripts ... and **automatically** assigning the valid electronic address to the user.” (Emphasis added). Applicants contend that neither Stern nor Bliss teach the feature of automatically determining the valid electronic address and automatically assigning the valid electronic address.

Moreover, the Office admits that Stern fails to teach that the electronic addresses are assigned to users. See Final Office Action, page 4. However, the Office points to Internet email service provider such as hotmail or yahoo and assert that these email servers assign a unique email address to a user. *Id.* In response to these assertions, Applicants contend that the features of determining a valid electronic address and assigning the valid electronic address to a user in claims 1, 8, 15, and 21 are **automatic**. In sharp contrast, the email service providers cited to by the Office require a user to choose his or her electronic address. Therefore, the chosen electronic addresses are not automatically determined and assigned as provided in the independent claims.

Applicants also assert that Stern in view of Bliss fails to teach or suggest “allowing an administrator to append at least one character to the previously unused electronic address that is at least one of the following: not unique or does not comply with the predetermined addressing standard, wherein appending the at least one character creates a valid electronic address.” See claim 1 (and similarly claims 8, 15, and 21). Applicants contend that Stern fails to provide allowing an administrator to append characters because Stern is concerned with reverse engineering preexisting electronic addresses. Further, Bliss fails to provide this feature because Bliss teaches linking two previously created electronic addresses and only checks for uniqueness within its own internal database. As such, Applicants contend that Stern in view of Bliss fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of the independent claims.

With respect to claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 21-26, the Office states that these claims are unpatentable over Stern in view of several different references. Applicants submit that none of these references cure the deficiencies of Bliss discussed above in connection with the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elaine Chi/

Date: November 19, 2008

Elaine Chi
Reg. No.: 61,194

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)